

The Washington Times.

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1901.

Publication Office.

THE HUTCHINS BUILDING

PENNsylvania AVENUE

Subscription by Mail—One Year:

Morning, Evening, and Sunday..... \$6.00

Morning and Sunday..... 4.00

Evening and Sunday..... 4.00

Sunday Only..... 1.00

Monthly by Carrier:

Morning, Evening, and Sunday..... \$1.00

Morning and Sunday..... .75

Evening and Sunday..... .75

Sunday Only..... .25

THE TIMES COMPANY,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Circulation Statement.

The circulation of The Times for the week

ended September 21, was as follows:

Sunday, September 21..... 20,419

Monday, September 22..... 45,398

Tuesday, September 23..... 41,990

Wednesday, September 24..... 43,294

Thursday, September 25..... 43,294

Friday, September 26..... 43,294

Saturday, September 27..... 41,135

Total..... 284,735

Daily average (Sunday, 20,419; excepted)..... 45,398

Mr. Babcock and Tariff Reform.

Representative Babcock is quoted as

still firm in the belief that the tariff

should be removed from tariff controlled

products, and as just as firmly insisting

that there is nothing Democratic in his

proposition.

Nobody is disposed to quarrel with

Mr. Babcock as to how his measure

shall be classified in a partisan way. It

matters very little whether it be called

Republican or Democratic, or received

no partisan designation whatever. It is

the essence of the thing that it is to

be considered. At the same time it is mor-

ally certain that the Democratic mem-

bership of Congress will give him a

practically unanimous support, if an

opportunity is afforded, and that the

Republicans of both Houses will be

overwhelmingly against him. It is al-

together probable that he will ever

stand it, but it is clearly not in line

with the prevailing current of Repub-

lican thought. Nearly all of the more

prominent of the party leaders, includ-

ing Mr. Hanna, have publicly an-

nounced their opposition to the mea-

sure, and their unwillingness to have

the tariff question opened. The Repub-

lican party as a whole has iterated and

reiterated that the Dingley law is the

primary cause of our great prosperity—in

fact, that it is the highest cause of

the prosperity of the country. Senator

Hanna has not been content to rest upon

this mere general idea, but he goes

further and openly declares that the

trusts are a natural and proper evolu-

tion, and that they are a positive ben-

efit to the country. From this it follows

that the Ohio Senator would oppose

with all his might any measure intend-

ed to curb the trusts and keep their

profits within reasonable bounds. There

are some matters, however, in which

he has not been altogether potent with

his party; but in this one the great bulk

of the party has thus far been with

him, and there can be no doubt that

when he declares the trusts to be good

for the country, he simply gives open

expression to what the most of his par-

tisan associates think, but are scarcely

bold enough to say.

It is a pleasure, though, to observe

that Mr. Babcock is standing his

ground firmly, and is arguing stoutly in

favor of his measure. We can well

suppose that he is the only Republican

whose eyes have been opened to the

magnitude of the trust evil and the

close connection which exists between

the tariff and the great industrial

combinations that so completely domi-

nate the business of the country. There-

fore, his attitude is encouraging to all who

desire genuine tariff reform. Mr. Ba-

bcock has a fine opportunity before him,

and it is to be hoped that he will meas-

ure up to it.

The Anarchist Problem.

Taking up the line of our previous

comments upon the national duty of

suppressing anarchism, the country

and either drive them out of it, or

shutting them up in strong quarters,

it must be evident to every intelligent

and decent citizen that, whatever else

the country may decide to do, it is im-

perative that the offense of assaulting

the President of the United States and

others in high authority, with intent to

kill or do them bodily harm, should be

made a crime of greater degree than

legality it at present enjoys.

The late President McKinley was

killed not because of anything he had

done as an individual, and by no means

because he was obnoxious personally to

the anarchists, but simply and solely

because, more than any other living

American, he represented the dignity

and majesty of the Republic, its Con-

stitution, laws, social organization, and

civilization. Under our old concepts it

was not dreamed that any man or or-

ganization of men ever would attempt

to strike at our country and its institu-

tions through the assassination of the

national Executive, or other high Gov-

ernment official. Hence, as the law

stands, the murder of President McKin-

ley was merely a crime against the per-

son, cognizable by the criminal code

adhering to their enemies, giving them aid

and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason

unless he be a citizen of the United States, and

the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

The anarchists, as a moral propo-

sition, do levy war against the United

States when they plot to kill, and kill

its President; but no such proposition

occurred to the framers of the Constitu-

tion. What they contemplated was not

the secret war against the State, soci-

ety, and all authority that anarchism

ceaselessly wages, but open war con-

ducted in a military manner. Perhaps

it might be well to make treason also

of the other kind. Be that as it may,

whether we must achieve the end by

Federal legislation, by constitutional

amendment, or by both, it is plain that

the murder of a President, if not of

a civilly placed national officer as

well, should be made a crime not local

but against the nation itself. And we

should not stop here. An attempt to as-

sassinate the Chief of State should be

made a national offense and pun-

ished capitally, and on the same rea-

soning, plotting to kill or do bodily

harm to the President should be pun-

ishable with death.

There is little doubt that the first

message of President Roosevelt to Con-

gress will present this question with his

customary directness and vigor. As far

as he is personally concerned we al-

ready have ample evidence of his indif-

ference to any danger to which his

friends may think him exposed; but he

has a duty to perform in recommending

measures for the extermination of the

vipers whose fangs were fastened fa-

tally in the heart of his lamented pre-

decessor, and we are satisfied that he is

not the man to shrink it.

American Credit.

That the credit of the American Gov-

ernment stands high, and with good

reason, is undoubtedly true, and it

should be a source of gratification to

every citizen of the Republic. The

financial strength of the Government is

owing to the enormous wealth and pro-

ductive capacity of the country. No

British consols bearing a higher inter-

est rate because they have more con-

fidence in the American Government

than they have in the British. There is

not a particle of doubt as to the sta-

bility or solvency of either. The simple

fact is that an American two per cent

bond is a better investment than a

British consol yielding two and three-

fourths per cent.

The ease with which the two per cent

bonds were floated was owing to the

circumstances that they could be used as

a basis for national bank circulation.

A bank taking a hundred thousand dol-

lars' worth of such bonds could at once

redeem them with the Treasury and

receive exactly the same amount in

bank notes, the most of which could be

loaned out again at much higher rates.

In effect, the bonds cost the banks

nothing, and simply add two per cent

to its profits, without risk. There are

comparatively few people in the United

States who would care to invest in two

per cent bonds if there were not some-

thing in the transaction over and above

the mere interest returns. Such invest-

ments, when made, would generally be

temporary, the investor knowing that

he could turn the bond into money

again when he saw a chance to do

better with it.

The Schley Court Proceedings.

The proceedings at the Court of En-

quiry yesterday were enlivened by a

slight but unsanguinary tilt between

Captain Harber, formerly executive of-

ficer of the Texas, who was on the wit-

ness stand, and the Hon. Isidor Rayner,

Attorney General of Maryland, one of

Rear Admiral Schley's counsel. Appar-

ently, Captain Harber did not approach

the tribunal on this occasion in the

most cool and benign mood.

The first question to be asked by

Captain Harber was, "Do you con-

sider the sinking of the Texas to be a

disaster?" The answer was "Yes," said

Rayner. "Do you bite your thumb at me,

sir?" but the principle was the same.

The distinguished counsel for the ap-

plicant pointed out to the witness certain

discrepancies in his testimony of the day

before concerning the blockade patrol

of the Flying Squadron in front of San-

tiago Harbor, and then proceeded to

take up the question of the Brooklyn's

loss during the battle. In this connection

Captain Harber had testified on the

previous day that the engines of the

Texas had been reversed to avoid col-

lision with the flag ship. Mr. Rayner

enquired whether or not that fact

should appear upon the log. The wit-

ness replied that it should. Being

handed the log, he was unable to find

any such entry, but stated that other

items which ought to be inscribed on it

were missing. In calling Captain Har-

ber to the attention of the testimony of

Admiral Higginson, which appeared to

contradict his own on certain points,

Mr. Rayner imprudently pointed the

customary cross-examining finger at

the witness in blue. Now, the latter

ought to have known that legal regu-

lations and ethics no more permit a

lawyer to cross-examine without that

finger than naval regulations and eth-

ics allow an officer to belittle the

attention of his fellow officers. The

are constantly taking place. The in-

vention of smokeless powder, and the

longer range of firearms, are changes

which make strongly felt. The de-

velopment of the machine gun, and the

important modifications in the or-

der of battle formation, these facts

have been recognized for some time

past irrespective of the happenings in

South Africa. It must be remembered

that the struggle of the Boers is al-

together a unique one. The burghers

have introduced very little that is new

into the science of fighting. In the

main they have simply applied prin-

ciples already known to the peculiar

circumstances in which they found them-

selves placed. Their ability to continue

the war so long in the face of over-

whelming odds has been owing less to

their tactics in battle than to the avoid-

ance of battle, except when they could

fight with advantages on their side.

This nature of the country has en-

abled them to do it. It would be utterly

impossible for an European nation to

assume the character of the struggle in

South Africa. Not one of the great

Powers has yet undertaken to reorgani-

ze its army as a result of the Boer

war, and no sign has been given of any

purpose to do so. Obviously, the tactics

which it is claimed have revolutionized

the art of war can only be pursued

where the conditions are somewhat

similar to those which prevail in the

Transvaal and the Orange Free State.

British consols bearing a higher inter-

est rate because they have more con-

fidence in the American Government

than they have in the British. There is

not a particle of doubt as to the sta-

bility or solvency of either. The simple

fact is that an American two per cent

bond is a better investment than a

British consol yielding two and three-

fourths per cent.

The ease with which the two per cent

bonds were floated was owing to the

circumstances that they could be used as

a basis for national bank circulation.

A bank taking a hundred thousand dol-

lars' worth of such bonds could at once

redeem them with the Treasury and

receive exactly the same amount in

bank notes, the most of which could be

loaned out again at much higher rates.

In effect, the bonds cost the banks

nothing, and simply add two per cent

to its profits, without risk. There are